arXiv:nucl-th/0008063v1 30 Aug 2000

$\pi - N$ FROM AN EXTENDED EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORY

P. J. ELLIS
School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA
E-mail: ellis@physics.spa.umn.edu

Third order chiral perturbation theory accounts for the $\pi - N$ scattering phase shift data out to energies slightly below the position of the Δ resonance. The low energy constants are not accurately determined. Explicit inclusion of the Δ field is favored.

1 Introduction

In order to describe $\pi - N$ scattering up to at least the delta resonance region it would seem to be mandatory to include the Δ isobar, along with the nucleon and pion fields, as in Refs. [1,2]. When baryon mass scales are involved in loop diagrams the systematic counting of chiral perturbation theory [3] in powers of small momenta Q, of order of the pion mass, is lost. It is restored in heavy baryon chiral perturbation theory by working with an effective Lagrangian in which the heavy components of the baryon fields have been integrated out. An alternative is to manipulate the loop diagrams themselves and remove the contributions from hard momenta of order of the baryon masses. These are then absorbed in the low energy constants of the Lagrangian. To one loop order these two approaches give equivalent results (the latter has been generalized in the infra-red regularization scheme [4], see Becher's talk regarding the threshold regime). Note that the delta-nucleon mass difference is taken to be of order Q. A practical difficulty is that the Δ propagator can go on shell leading to an infinite contribution to the scattering amplitude. In Ref. [1] this was solved by summing up the leading order, complex Δ self-energy diagrams so that the propagator remained finite; unitarity was obeyed except for a very small energy region. In Ref. [2] the real part of the scattering amplitude was assumed to be the K matrix so that unitarity was automatically obeyed.

2 Results

To order Q^2, no loops occur so it is necessary to use the K-matrix approximation. The $\pi N \Delta$ coupling can be determined from the Δ decay width; note that changes in the off-shell parameter for the vertex can be absorbed in the low energy constants [5] so that any convenient value can be chosen. There are four low energy constants to be fitted to the S- and P-wave $\pi - N$ phase shift

data. The data can be fit [2,6] up to a c.m. pion kinetic energy of $\epsilon \sim 50$ MeV (pion laboratory momentum $p \sim 150$ MeV). Going to order Q^3 increases the number of low energy constants to be fitted by about a factor of three and a large number of loop diagrams need to be calculated. The calculations of Refs. [1,2] treated unitarity differently, as mentioned, and also fitted different data sets, nevertheless common trends appear. The fit to the phase shifts extends further to an energy of $\epsilon \sim 100$ MeV ($p \sim 250$ MeV), slightly below the Δ resonance position. These results show a considerable improvement over an order Q^3 calculation [7] which excluded the Δ field, particularly in the $P33$ channel as might be expected. They are comparable to, perhaps a little better than, an order Q^4 calculation [8] with just the π and N fields. It is also worth remarking that the convergence of the chiral series is much better when the Δ field is explicitly included. At order Q^3 the πNN vertex is dressed by a series of loop diagrams, nevertheless the effective coupling remains close to the tree-level value [1] and the Goldberger-Treiman discrepancy is a few percent in agreement with a determination from pionic hydrogen data and the GMO sum rule [9]. The effective $\pi N\Delta$ couping also remains close to the tree-level value. The low energy constants are not accurately determined and unconstrained fits often produce unreasonable values for the sigma term. Nevertheless the fits are only slightly degraded if it is constrained. A value close to the canonical [10] 45 MeV is obtained [2] with the Karlsruhe data, whereas a larger figure ~ 75 MeV is favored [1] with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute data.

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge partial support from the US Department of Energy under grant no. DE-FG02-87ER40328.

References

1. P.J. Ellis and H.-B. Tang, *Phys. Rev.* C **57**, 3356 (1998).
2. N. Fettes and Ulf-G. Meissner, hep-ph/0006299, *Nucl. Phys.* A, in press.
3. S. Weinberg, *Nucl. Phys.* B **363**, 3 (1991).
4. T. Becher and H. Leutwyler, *Eur. Phys. J.* C **9**, 643 (1999).
5. H.-B. Tang and P.J. Ellis, *Phys. Lett.* B **387**, 9 (1996).
6. P.J. Ellis and H.-B. Tang, *Phys. Rev.* C **56**, 3363 (1997).
7. N. Fettes, Ulf-G. Meissner and S. Steininger, *Nucl. Phys.* A **640**, 199 (1998).
8. N. Fettes and Ulf-G. Meissner, *Nucl. Phys.* A **676**, 311 (2000).
9. H.-Ch. Schröder *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* B **469**, 25 (1999).
10. J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler and M.E. Sainio, *Phys. Lett.* B **253**, 252 (1991).